

VZCZCXYZ0001
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHTC #0357/01 0581104
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
O 271104Z FEB 07
FM AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 8315
INFO RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY
RUCPDOG/DEPT OF COMMERCE WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEBAAA/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC PRIORITY

UNCLAS THE HAGUE 000357

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

STATE FOR ISN/CB, VCI/CCB, L/ACV, IO/S
SECDEF FOR OSD/ISP
JOINT STAFF FOR DD PMA-A FOR WTC
COMMERCE FOR BIS (GOLDMAN)
NSC FOR LEDDY
WINPAC FOR WALTER

E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [CWC](#)
SUBJECT: CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION (CWC): WRAP-UP FOR THE
WEEK ENDING FEBRUARY 23

This is CWC-18-07.

REVCON PREPARATORY MEETING

¶1. (U) Ambassador Parker (UK) chaired a meeting of the open-ended working group for the Second Review Conference on February 20. The meeting covered the modalities for a possible meeting of States Parties and NGOs, as well as the implementation of the CWC relating to general obligations and declarations; general provisions on verification; and CW and CW facilities. Parker had scheduled the morning and afternoon for consultations, but in the end most delegations seemed to lack guidance from capitals, so the consultation wrapped up after the morning session.

¶2. (U) After the meeting, Parker told del rep that he was surprised by the limited amount of input from delegations, particularly on the destruction issue. Parker said that he had expected much more criticism of major possessors' destruction efforts.

¶3. (U) On the proposed meeting with NGOs, Parker suggested that delegates consider holding the NGO meeting immediately after the academic conference in October or November, or immediately after the CSP this year. Of the three possibilities, Parker said he thought the first would be the best. He also advocated holding a meeting to review the outcome of the Scientific Advisory Board meeting during the summer.

¶4. (U) Sudan, speaking on behalf of the African group, which had just held a coordination meeting before the OEWG meeting, said that the African group opposed holding the NGO meeting concurrently with the revcon itself as had been done at the last revcon. Sudan said that only respected NGOs active in the field of arms control should take part in the meeting. Sudan also called for TS funding from the regular budget to subsidize the travel costs of NGOs from developing countries. South Africa, Iran, and Cuba proposed holding the NGO meeting in early 2008.

¶5. (U) India, after arriving at the meeting late and not having heard the earlier interventions made by delegations,

proposed holding the NGO meeting concurrently with the revcon. Parker noted the African Group request not to do so.

New Zealand and the U.S. also noted that the concurrent meeting had not worked so well at the last revcon. As a result, India withdrew its suggestion. The Netherlands said that holding the NGO meeting in January 2008 could be problematic as it would be too close to the revcon. The Dutch suggested holding the meeting in December 2007.

¶6. (U) South Korea urged the TS to post NGO documents on the website. Parker said that this issue could be considered, but that a filtering mechanism would have to be considered as well. He said that perhaps the external server would be more appropriate than the public website for NGO documentation. Turkey said that efforts should be made to encourage "geographic representation" be taken into account in inviting NGOs to the meeting. Parker deftly suggested that delegations and regional groups themselves could most effectively play a role in this by urging NGOs from their countries or regions attend the meeting. Iran proposed the creation of a trust fund to pay for the travel of NGOs from developing countries. Parker said that the EU may consider funding such travel.

¶7. (U) In the end, Parker said that the bureau would reflect on delegations comments on dates, the use of the website, NGO participation, and other issues and then revise the paper on these issues and redistribute it to SPs.

¶8. (U) On the second agenda item, the implementation of the CWC, Iran said that the revcon should reaffirm the obligations of the possessor states to destroy their stockpiles and note that the existence of CW stockpiles constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

Iran stated that the revcon would also have to make it clear that the failure of possessor states to meet destruction deadlines would constitute non-compliance with the CWC. Iran said that the use of incapacitants in Iraq raises questions that will have to be addressed by the revcon. The importance of universality should be emphasized at the revcon particularly "in states of serious concern" according to the Iranian Ambassador. He said that the transfer of schedule 3 chemicals to non-SPs, as well as the full and complete implementation of Article XI, would also have to be addressed. Finally, the Iranians proposed discussing the creation of an international support network for the victims of CW at the revcon.

¶9. (U) India emphasized the importance of upholding the CWC in its entirety and said it looked forward to reviewing the verification annex particularly in light of the TS experience since the last revcon. India looks forward to examining ways in which the TS could help SPs in completing their declarations.

¶10. (U) Germany said that it found the paper on the revcon of September 22 to be a useful starting point for issues that need to be covered during the revcon. The Germans emphasized that the revcon should not excessively focus on the future but rather on the past with a particular emphasis on implementation to date. In the German view, there is a backlog of outstanding issues that should be addressed. The Germans would also like a fuller discussion of the general purpose criterion, optimization, the verification of the conversion of CWPFF's, and guidelines on the frequency of inspections for schedule 1 facilities.

¶11. (U) France also advocated further examination of the general purpose criterion, as well as discussion of electronic declaration submissions, the VIR, and sampling and analysis. The UK noted the importance of deadlines and meeting them. They advocated an increase in spending by possessor states in order to meet the 2012 deadline. The UK highlighted the importance of all destruction activities being irreversible. They also noted that the CWC is a living document and that technological and scientific developments needed to be continued to be studied. The UK urged the DG to

ask the SAB to look into these issues. The UK also introduced a non-paper that it distributed on the general purpose criterion (e-mailed to ISN/CB on 2/20). The U.S. delegation circulated the non-paper provided in State 20175.

¶12. (U) Sudan requested an updated document listing outstanding issues since the last revcon. Germany and France supported the Sudanese request. Turkey called for a stronger focus on Article I obligations.

¶13. (U) The next meeting of the OEWG on the revcon will be on March 23, and will focus on activities not prohibited under the convention.

ARTICLE X

¶14. (U) Informal consultations on Article X were held on February 21 by the new facilitator Jitka Brodska (Czech Republic). The first topic was an overview of submissions on paragraphs 4 (National Programs Questionnaire) and 7 (Offers of Assistance Questionnaire). Muhammad Kazi of the Assistance and Protection Branch said every year the TS sends a reminder letter. This year they also asked Regional Bureaus to promote submissions, took a previous U.S. suggestion to add the formats to the OPCW website, and at each APB activity held, encouraged submissions. APB chief Gennadi Lutay said some offers originally made under para 7 were no longer valid, and the offers need to be renewed. He said the TS plans to renew efforts to obtain more bilateral agreements and will ask delegations to talk to their capitals.

¶15. (U) Germany suggested creating an action plan to raise the number of submissions, perhaps piggybacking on

universality and Article VII action plans. The suggestion of an action plan was supported by Colombia, the Netherlands, Iran and Algeria. The facilitator noted this and suggested that would be a basis of work for the next session. In the meantime she wanted to bring attention to submissions by mentioning the upcoming para 4 deadline in her remarks at EC-48, at which time the TS would hand-out copies of the format. The U.S. suggested adding the web address for the format. The TS said it would inform recipients that countries should submit even in the case of a nil declaration.

¶16. (U) The next topic was APB activities for 2006 and projected activities for 2007. The TS noted they want to do additional regional courses, over the one per year they currently do in Africa and Asia, noting high risk countries need more activities. The facilitator suggested using the 2008 budget as a lever to focus on APB programs, to see where there are gaps and fill them. She told delegations she wanted to encourage a strategic approach to APB programs. South Korea echoed the facilitator. They said the TS needs to coordinate regional and national programs to get the information together in order to build on previous events with both small and large activities, and basic courses should be followed-up by advanced courses. The Netherlands said delegations need to see how resources (the TS budget, voluntary contributions and in-kind offers) fit together before digging at the budget.

¶17. (U) The TS is continuing to look into linking the databank to the external server so National Authorities can access it. However they are still researching the technology to do this securely.

¶18. (U) Under any other business, the U.S. strongly encouraged the TS to finish the status of implementation report and distribute it to SPs as soon as possible before the EC so capitals have enough time to evaluate it. There was no response from other delegations. Also, the U.S. requested the TS finish the Joint Assistance Exercise 2005 Lessons Learned Report as soon as possible and asked if the TS had been working on the next major exercise -- perhaps in

SIPDIS

the Asian region as suggested in previous consultations. The TS responded by saying they had not had a proposal from a

SIPDIS

partner, which is essential. Lutay said that he would like to have another exercise in 2008, however planning should begin now, as 18 months is needed to prepare for such an exercise.

¶19. (U) Iran asked delegations to consider beginning work on implementing paragraph 11 of Article X, noting that victims of CW suffer in the long-term, rather than short-term. They realize it is something of a static clause, but suggested consultations to develop an idea, a framework or concept paper on the issue. There was no response, however this does follow comments made in their national statements over the last two ECs and CSP-11.

¶20. (U) The facilitator said the next meeting would be at beginning of May in order to get a better idea of how many para 4 submissions are received by the April 30 deadline. Documents (including submissions up-to-February 20) have been faxed to ISN-CB.

UNIVERSALITY UPDATE

¶21. (U) Del rep met with Malik Ellahi (External Relations Division) to discuss plans for the proposed Universality for Africa workshop to be held in Algiers. A similar workshop had been proposed and then canceled by the Algerians last year. According to Ellahi, the TS and the Algerians are still moving on planning for the workshop likely to be held in June 2007. Malik told del rep that this would likely be one of the last universality workshops. He said that ERD would fund the travel of the non-SPs from Africa and the EU would use left-over money from last year to fund the travel of several African SPs who would share their experiences with the non-SPs. Del will continue to monitor planning for the workshop.

¶22. (U) Javits sends.
BLAKEMAN